

March 15, 2013

Hon. James M. Peck United States Bankruptcy Court One Bowling Green, Courtroom 601 New York, NY 10004 Robert J. Lemons, Esq. Maurice Horowitz, Esq. Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP 767 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10153

Office of the United States Trustee for Region 2
33 Whitehall Street, 21<sup>st</sup> Floor
New York, NY 10004
Attn: Tracy Hope Davis, Esq.

Elisabetta Gasparini, Esq. Andrea B. Schwartz, Esq.

Re: Response to Debtors' Three-Hundred Ninety-Sixth Omnibus Objection to Claims (Warrant Claims) Chapter 11 Case No. 08-13555 (JMP) Claim No. 24455– (Case No. 08-13893)

Dear Sir or Madam:

At the outset, I note that I am a retail investor, not an institutional investor. In short, the Debtors' Objection seeks to rewrite the Warrants and unfairly disadvantage me to the Debtors' benefit. The Warrants represented sophisticated contracts pursuant to which LBHI derived significant benefits, all while utilizing my dollars, and now seeks to hide behind the veil of bankruptcy to my further detriment. At a minimum, the Court should require the Debtors to provide detailed information concerning the nature of the option contracts and provide each of the retail investors with sufficient accounting of the market value of the Warrants on the date I would have otherwise been entitled to receive my cash return and not September 15, 2008.

March 15, 2013 Page 2

In conclusion, I ask that the Court reject that portion of the Debtors' request to reduce the amount of my Claim against LBHI and require LBHI to provide more information as to the nature and value of the Warrants as of the contractual strike date for each Warrant.

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Schwartz

1255 W. Draper St.

Chicago, IL 60614